

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/501,343	REISACHER ET AL.	
	Examiner Patricia L. Hailey	Art Unit 1755	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Patricia L. Hailey. (3) _____.
 (2) Harris Pitlick. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 June 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nyssen (U.S. Patent No. 6,646,023), and Gonzalez-Blanco et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,110,266).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Patricia L. Hailey
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The differences between the cited references and the claimed invention (e.g., the criticality in that the claimed invention is a solid pigment preparation, while the prior art discloses the presence of water), were discussed, as were proposed amendments to the claims to overcome the 112(2) rejections of record. Additionally, the pending double patenting rejections were discussed. Upon the filing of a response to the outstanding Office Action, all pending claims will be reconsidered. .